

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION**

NATHANIEL HARVEY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	NO. 4:22-CV-61-CDL-MSH
	:	
S. WILSON, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's motions seeking sanctions against Defendants and an extension of time (ECF Nos. 41, 45). Defendants filed responses to the motion seeking sanctions (ECF Nos. 44, 46), but Plaintiff did not reply. For the following reasons, Plaintiff's motions are denied.

As to Plaintiff's motion seeking sanctions against Defendants, Plaintiff asserts that Defendants did not "complete the court ordered depositions," which allegedly placed Defendants in contempt of the Court's Order of April 20, 2023. Br. in Supp. of Mot. for Sanctions 1, ECF No. 41. Defendants, however, respond that they took Plaintiff's deposition on July 27, 2023. Merritt Resp. 2, ECF No. 44; Wilson and Merritt Resp. 2, ECF No. 46. Further, the discovery deadline set by the Court on April 20, 2023 (ECF No. 36) was extended again May 30, 2023, such that discovery was to be complete by July 31, 2023 (ECF No. 38). Finally, to the extent that Plaintiff asserts that Defendants did not timely respond to his request for production of documents (ECF No. 41, at 1), Defendants

submit a certificate of service showing a timely response. Merritt Resp., Ex. A, ECF No. 44-1. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion seeking sanctions against Defendants (ECF No. 41) is **DENIED**.

As to Plaintiff's motion seeking an extension of time, it is unclear of what deadline Plaintiff seeks an extension. Plaintiff appears to request an extension of time to respond to Defendants' alleged rejection of his production of documents and a "deposition discovery order." Br. in Supp. of Mot. for Ext. of Time 1, ECF No. 45. As noted, however, Defendants timely responded to Plaintiff's request for production of documents, and the Court did not enter a deposition discovery order. Further, Plaintiff's deposition has already been taken. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion seeking an extension of time (ECF No. 45) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 28th day of September, 2023.

/s/ Stephen Hyles
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE